

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-33 remain standing in this application. Reconsideration and allowance of the standing claims are respectfully requested.

The disclosure stands objected to because of informalities. The Office Action states that the description for elements 19 and 21 do not match FIGS. 1A and 1B. Line 2 of Page 8 of the disclosure has been amended to correspond to original FIG. 1A and FIG. 2B as amended. Removal of this objection is respectfully requested.

The drawings stand objected to because of inconsistent use of labels for FIGS. 1A and 1B. In FIG. 1B, the send queue has been modified from number 19 to number 21, and the receive queue has been modified from number 21 to number 19, to match similar labels used for FIG. 1A. Removal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Data and Computer Communications, Fifth Edition, William Stallings, 1997 ("Stallings"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 1-5 each recite the feature of "at least one virtual interface (VI) work queue." An example of a "VI work queue" may be a VI work queue as described in the Virtual Interface (VI) Architecture Specification, Version 1.0, December 16, 1997 ("VI Architecture Specification"). Specification, Page 6: Lines 5-8.

Stallings discloses a technique to provide LAN emulation over a connection-oriented network such as ATM. More particularly, Stallings describes a centralized LAN emulation service for nodes in a network, including setting up connections and mapping MAC addresses to ATM addresses.

Stallings fails to disclose a VI work queue as recited in claims 1-5. Stallings does not mention the use of a VI work queue in any context, let alone for performing LAN emulation. The Office Action states that an ATM cell contains virtual channel identifiers as described on page 490 and shown in FIG. 14.14 on page 490. Office Action, Page 3. Page 490 and FIG. 14.14, however, both fail to mention the use of virtual channel identifiers. The Office Action further states that it is inherent that a virtual channel comprises memory buffers as storage means to store memory address information, and that the memory buffers comprise VI work queues. Office Action, Page 3. Applicant respectfully disagrees. A memory buffer alone does not comprise a VI work queue. A VI work queue stores descriptors and processes the descriptors in a well-defined manner, as described in the VI Architecture Specification. Stallings fails to mention a memory buffer in any context, let alone operating as a VI work queue. Further, a VI work queue is not inherently disclosed by a virtual channel. The type of virtual channel used in an ATM system is a very specific technique to connect a pair of ATM nodes, and has no relation to a VI work queue as recited in the claimed subject matter.

For at least the reasons given above, claims 1-5 represents patentable subject matter over Stallings. Removal of this rejection for claims 1-5 is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 6-13 each recite the language "mapping a first physical address of a remote node to a second physical address of the remote node...wherein the second physical address is embedded within the first physical address."

Stallings fails to disclose at least this feature of claim 6-13. As previously discussed, the LAN emulation service described by Stallings includes a technique to map

a MAC address to an ATM address. Stallings fails to disclose, however, having a MAC address embedded within an ATM address, or vice-versa.

For at least the reasons given above, claims 6-13 represent patentable subject matter over Stallings. Removal of this rejection for claims 6-13 is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 14-20 each recite the language “to determine a first physical address to a network address correspondence for a node of the network and to determine a first physical address to a second physical address correspondence for the node in the network, without use of specialized protocol to determine the first physical address to a second physical address correspondence.”

Stallings fails to disclose at least this feature of claim 14-20. As previously discussed, the LAN emulation service described by Stallings includes a technique to map a MAC address to an ATM address. This operation, however, requires the use of a specialized protocol, such as the address resolution protocol (ARP). By way of contrast, claims 14-20 do not need to use a specialized protocol to map a first physical address to a second physical address. The Office Action states that “Stallings discloses [that] a LAN emulation module converts MAC frames to ATM cells without use of a specialized protocol.” Office Action, Page 4, Citations Omitted. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In Stallings, this conversion only occurs after the specialized protocol is used to retrieve one of the two addresses. Thus, according to Stallings the mapping operation, if at all, occurs prior to this conversion.

For at least the reasons given above, claims 14-20 represent patentable subject matter over Stallings. Removal of this rejection for claims 14-20 is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 27 recites the language "determining a local physical address corresponding to the legacy physical address based on the legacy physical address without use of a specialized address request protocol."

Stallings fails to disclose at least this feature of claim 27. Claim 27 recites that a local physical address may be determined from a legacy physical address. As discussed with reference to claims 6-13, Stallings fails to describe determining one address from another address. Further, this determination may be made without use of a specialized address request protocol. As discussed with reference to claims 14-20, Stallings uses ARP to map a pair of addresses.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 27 represents patentable subject matter over Stallings. Removal of this rejection for claim 27 is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 21-26 and 28-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stallings. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

According to the MPEP, three basic criteria must be met to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be

found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See MPEP 706.02(j).

The Office Action has failed to meet the first criteria for obviousness as recited above. Stallings fails to provide some suggestion or motivation to modify the techniques disclosed by Stallings in an attempt to arrive at the claimed invention. Claims 28-33 depend from claim 27. Claims 21-26 have features similar to claim 27. As discussed previously, Stallings fails to disclose several features of claim 27. Since these missing features are not disclosed by Stallings, it follows *a fortiori* that Stallings would not provide the requisite suggestion or motivation. Since Stallings does not provide the requisite suggestion or motivation, the Office Action fails to meet its burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

The Office Action has also failed to meet the third criteria for obviousness. According to the third criteria for obviousness, the reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations for claims 21-26 and 28-33. As correctly noted in the Office Action, "Stallings does not specifically disclose the use of LAN emulation module as a method to obtain both local physical addresses and legacy physical address." Further, the Office Action states that "Stallings does not specifically disclose the use of the AAL5 as a method to map local physical addresses to connection-oriented VI channels." In addition, the Office Action states that "Stallings does not specifically disclose the use of RARP protocol to broadcast a request message to establish VI channels between nodes." Office Action, Page 8. These missing features are not shown by Stallings or any other cited reference. Since all the claim limitations

Application No. 09/599,000  
Amendment Dated 1/23/2004  
Reply to Office Action of October 23, 2004

are not shown by the cited references, the Office Action fails to meet its burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness.


For at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-33 recite novel features not shown by the cited reference(s). Further, Applicant submits that the above-recited novel features provide new and unexpected results not recognized by the cited reference(s). Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claims are not anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the cited reference(s).

It is believed that claims 1-33 are in allowable form. Accordingly, a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 724-933-3387 to discuss any matter concerning this application.


The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

  
John F. Kaovinsky, Reg. No. 40,040  
Under 37 CFR 1.34(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to:  
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on: 1/23/04.

  
Deborah Higham

  
1/23/04  
Date

Dated: 1/23/04

12400 Wilshire Blvd., 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025

Application No. 09/599,000  
Amendment Dated 1/23/2004  
Reply to Office Action of October 23, 2004

**Appendix** including amended drawing figures.